*Carthago*, genitive *carthaginis*) or an intermediate *carthagen-*. Jacquin's stem, *carthagen-*, represents a latinization of Cartagena as *Carthagena*, treating it as if it were a First Declension name (genitive *carthagenae*, stem *carthagen-*). This is clearly not classical Latin which would be *Carthago* (genitive *carthaginis*, stem *carthagin-*) of Third Declension. Purists would object to such a neolatinization as *Carthagena* but it strikes me as a perfectly reasonable option. As such I believe *carthagenensis* should be maintained under the paragraph of Art. 73 (ICBN) which states that when changes made in orthography by earlier authors who adopt geographic names are intentional latinizations, they are to be preserved.

"In another case, *Panicum chartaginense* Swartz (*Nov. Gen. Sp.* p. 22. 1788), Swartz has made yet another neolatinization of Cartagena which he cites as *Chartagena*. A classical scholar would substitute *carthaginense*, but under the Code I believe this would not be acceptable and that the original spelling should stand.

"Obviously it is hard to draw a firm distinction between orthographic (including typographic) errors and intentional latinizations. One can say that *carthagenense* and *chartaginense* are errors to justify correcting both to *carthaginense*. Likewise, one can say that these are intentional latinizations and accept original spelling. Intention is subjective and can lead to legitimate disagreement in cases like this. However, the Preamble to the Code tells us that, 'Other considerations, such as absolute grammatical correctness, regularity or euphony of names, more or less prevailing custom, regard for persons, etc., notwithstanding their undeniable importance, are relatively accessory.' Under this concept I favor accepting original spelling, in most cases" (Pers. comm., 1978).

The correct epithet is thus *Cuphea carthagenensis*, not *C. carthaginensis* or *C. carthagensis*. Users of the floras cited above should correct the name in those works to include the omitted syllable.—*Shirley A. Graham, c/o Alan Graham, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, OH, 44242.*

*ZAMIA* (CYCADACEAE) NEW FOR GEORGIA—This is the first report for the natural occurrence of *Zamia* in Georgia. It is reported by Small (1933) for Florida, occurring the most abundantly in the peninsular portion of the state. Lawrence (1951) states that *Zamia* in the United States is "restricted almost exclusively to Florida, with an additional station reported in adjoining Alabama." There appear to be no specimens to support the natural occurrence of *Zamia* in Alabama. Dr. Robert Kral of Vanderbilt University, who has been working intensively on the flora of Alabama for several years, says in a recent communication that to his knowledge it does not and has not occurred naturally in Alabama, but that "there is every likelihood that someone could have reported it as an escape—."

In northeast Florida *Zamia* is documented by herbarium specimens north into St. John's County. The Georgia records are from Camden and Glynn Counties, with Duval and Nassau Counties, Fla., intervening. The classification and nomenclature of *Zamia* species in Florida are in confusion. Until these problems are resolved it seems best to refer to the Georgia material as

*Z. umbrosa* Small which Small (1933) reports for "Hammocks, sand-dunes, and shell mounds, NE Fla."

The first collection presumed to be from Georgia was sent in for naming to the University of Georgia Harbarium in 1928 by Gertrude Proctor. Within a year or so after my arrival at the University of Georgia in 1938 I corresponded with Ms. Proctor in regard to the *Zamia*. The specimen had been given to her for naming from near Woodbine, Camden County. Ms. Proctor could not remember or find out who sent the specimen, but thought it was collected in a hammock. She and I searched considerably for the species in Camden County without success. There seemed to be a strong possibility that the specimen had been collected in Florida by someone living near Woodbine. Hence, I did not report *Zamia* for Georgia at that time.

My beliefs are now altered by my collection of *Zamia* from St. Simon's Island, Glynn County, where, according to Albert Fendig, Sr., a local resident, it occurs in a few scattered natural localities, but nowhere abundantly. My collection was made from one of three plants under a *Quercus virginiana* tree in a woods dominated by this and other evergreen species. *Pinus* was scattered, *Vitis* common.

In view of the above, *Zamia* should be considered native to Camden and Glynn Co., Georgia. The collections reported are: Camden Co.: [with male cone] Apr 1928, GA18054. Glynn Co.: *Duncan 26359*. Vigorous plant with about 20 leaves and "fruiting."—Elev. ca. 25 ft. 17 Sep 1971, GA100484. —*Wilbur H. Duncan, Department of Botany, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602.*

## REFERENCES

LAWRENCE, G.H.M. 1951. Taxonomy of vascular plants. MacMillan Co., N.Y. 823p.
SMALL, J. K. 1933. Manual of the southeastern flora. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. 1554p.

*GALIUM* SPECIES NEW TO THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES—While preparing a treatment of *Galium* for the *Flora of the Southeastern United States*, I examined specimens which proved to be *Galium tricornutum* Dandy and *Galium palustre* L. Both species are previously unrecorded for the southeastern United States.

*Galium tricornutum* is a Eurasian species which occurs sporadically in the eastern United States and is reported from California (Munz, 1959) and western Oregon (Hitchcock, 1959). This species superficially resembles *G. aparine* L.

Specific collection data for specimens from the southeastern United States are as follows: ARKANSAS: Miller Co.: Red River bottom, E of Texarkana, 3 May 1951, *Moore 510145* (UARK). GEORGIA: Oglethorpe Co.: banks of artificial pond, just W of Dry Fork Creek between Lexington and Washington, 17 May 1952, *Duncan 13541* (GA). SOUTH CAROLINA: Cherokee Co.: